priests. The Roman senators in the first century B.C., through acquiring by gift or purchase vast estates in Asia Minor, threatened to feudalize this region once more, but the confiscatory policy of the Claudian emperors checked this tendency, and from the time of Vespasian to Hadrian the attempt was made here, as in Africa, to create on the public domains a class of λαοί whose first loyalty would be given to their feudal lord—the emperor himself. A whole series of general enactments was issued (e.g., the *lex Manciana* and the *lex Hadriana de agris rudibus* in Africa) to effect this purpose, the net result being, however, to substitute, in the third century A.D. and thereafter, for a senator of the old style an imperial official as feudal lord between the λαοί and the emperor.

Rostowzew's *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* is one of the most illuminating works on ancient history which has appeared in recent years. It is bound to be fundamental for all future studies on the economic history of Hellenistic and Roman times. The *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* is to be congratulated on the character, if not on the style, of its first *Beiheft*.

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON

Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes. Second Part, "The Syntax of the Simple Sentence Continued, Embracing the Doctrine of the Article." By BASIL LANNAU GILDERSLEEVE with the co-operation of CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. —The Doctrine of the Article Elaborated, by PROFESSOR MILLER.—New York: American Book Co., 1911.

In reviewing this volume it is assumed that the reader is familiar with the first part and the remarks made in the preface of that volume concerning the arrangement adopted which the author himself hints may not be the best; "but to refashion the book," says he, "would require more time than the speeding years will allow me to presume on." From the preface of this second part we learn that Professor Miller, who aided also in the preparation of Part I, rendered still greater service. Then we read: "The disparateness of the two parts was inevitable under the circumstances, and the delay occasioned by the co-operation has been so great that it has seemed best at this point to dissolve the partnership, maintained for so many years, as it would have been dissolved at any rate in the natural course of things. An outline of what remains is in progress, and though it is high time that I cut down long hope to match the brief space of human life, I do not hesitate to commit myself to a plan that involves little more than the shaping of material already in hand."

To review a work of Gildersleeve, a scholar whose utterance is law, can be little more than simply to state its contents. The first part (which appeared ten years ago) is devoted to the simple sentence. The second

part takes up the simple sentence expanded by multiplication and qualification of both the subject and the predicate. In this volume the multiplication and qualification only of the subject are treated, with some unavoidable incursions into the territory of the predicate. The multiplication of the subject covers eight pages. Then the qualification is taken up and the qualifying attributes are classified into the adjective (including the participle) and its equivalents, and apposition. First are treated the equivalents of the adjective (except relative clauses and pronouns including the article), sixteen pages. Next peculiar forms of the adjective attribute are taken up with the statement: "The demonstrative and other adjective pronouns present important peculiarities. Of these pronouns the most common is the article," and the rest of the book is devoted to the article, one hundred and sixteen pages. In this last subdivision the difficulties attending the arrangement and classification of topics become manifest; for of course it is desirable to discuss the article exhaustively in one continuous treatment, and to do this it is necessary to treat the article in the predicate as well as in the subject, which the author very properly does not hesitate to do.

Throughout the work the treatment of each special topic is as follows: first a concise statement of the facts; then a few selected illustrations, in heavy-faced type and translated; finally numerous examples (in small type) running from the Attic orators back to Homer's *Iliad*. The order usually adopted begins: Dinarchus, Lycurgus, Hyperides, Demosthenes, etc. One cannot, however, quarrel with the author for not calling his work "a Syntax of Classical Greek from *Homer* to *Dinarchus*."

In rare instances and for special reasons examples are translated, and occasionally a remark is made on an example. A larger number of such remarks would have been most welcome to Greek scholars, but no doubt the size of the book had to be considered. Two or three illustrations of the result of conciseness will here be stated.

On the "singular predicate agreeing with nearest or most important subject" (473) are quoted as many as six examples in which the plural verb, if left where the singular verb stands, would lead to the σχῆμα ᾿Αλκμανικόν, and some of these are in prose, as ὁ δὲ Δημοσθένης δειπνήσας ἐχώρει καὶ τὸ ἄλλο στράτευμα. Here a remark that ἐχώρουν could not be used would have been in order.

Again, in the treatment of the chorographic genitive the brevity of statement leads to omission of the fact that the name of the place on which the chorographic genitive depends regularly dispenses with the article unless it is a word that always requires the article, and in those instances in which the name of the region put in the genitive in any case requires the article still the genitive is felt to be chorographic, thus causing the article to be omitted from the name of the town or place. It is stated, once generally and again in a special case, that the example does not count if the noun in the choro-

graphic genitive would at any rate require the article. On the other hand, in illustrating names of countries or regions that require the article, is there not the same reason for omitting examples like ἐς Πάνορμον τῆς Μιλησίας (547) on the ground that the chorographic genitive would of itself require the article? So might be cited Xen. *Hell.* vi. 5. 24: ἐν Οἰῷ τῆς Σκιρίτιδος, and Thuc. v. 23. 1: ἐπὶ τῇ Σκιρίτιδι τῆς Λακωνικῆς, where both names require the article of themselves; and yet the genitives are felt to be chorographic.

On the predicate with the article (668) we read: "In sentences of identification the articular adjective or participle is to be regarded as the subject. Hence examples like . . . . ἔστι δ', ἔφη, Ἐρατοσθένης . . . ὁ ταῦτα πράττων . . . . have been omitted from the following list." Now this list contains ὁ Κτήσιππος ἦν ὁ ταῦτα εἰπών. Hence it is evident that the above statement is intended only for clauses in which the other member of the identification is anarthrous. Even then possibly it would be safer to say "may be regarded" instead of "is to be regarded," since in such cases the participle requires the article; for ἔστι . . . . πράττων would have been almost unintelligible in the classic age and could only have meant πράττει as in Hellenistic ἦν διδάσκων, equivalent to ἐδίδασκεν. We need here also to discriminate between the adjective and the participle, as the latter after the copula εἶναι *must* have the article. Twenty examples, ranging from Demosthenes to Herodotus, are cited illustrating the article with a participle as predicate after εἶναι. Even ὁ αὐτός as predicate is cited eight times. In one of these examples the subject (consisting of a pair of words) is anarthrous, λέγων μὲν τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι πῦρ τε καὶ ἥλιον.

On the "use and omission of the article with the predicate" (666) a more emphatic insistence and fuller illustration would have been useful to those scholars who think that ἐμὸς ἀδελφός in Xen. *An.* i. 7. 9 means "a brother of mine" and that "my brother" would be ὁ ἐμὸς ἀδελφός.

These, however, are unimportant matters, and we must welcome this work as giving the most accurate and complete treatment of the article in Greek that has ever been published. Only one or two minor topics escaped the notice of the reviewer, if they are discussed: one is the loose order, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Σωκράτους with the limitations of ὁ υἱὸς Σωκράτους and analogous formulae. To this omission may possibly be added the use of an articular attribute or appositive expression (in the nominative), added to the vocative, as in πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κτέ, and ὦ γεραιὰ μῆτερ ἡ Ξέρξου φίλη. The articular neuter and plural of any gender preceded by ὦ seems not to be noted. These last usages may seem unworthy of mention, and yet a famous European Hellenist, sorely afflicted with the *emendandi cacoethes*, once wrote as follows: "Soph. *Philoct.* 867:

> ὦ φέγγος ὕπνου διάδοχον, τό τ'ἐλπίδων
> ἄπιστον οἰκούρημα τῶνδε τῶν ξένων.

Nec Graecae neque ullius linguae proprium est articulum addere vocativo!"
Then he proceeded to mutilate the passage.

The book is almost entirely free from misprints—a fact to be wondered
at when the vast number of fine-print examples is considered. It may be
noted that in this second part substantive ὃ μέν, ὃ δέ, etc., have the accent
and that σώζω (no iota) and Τροιζήνιος occur.

There is a good Table of Contents. No index can be expected, pre-
sumably, until the entire work is complete.

The printed pages are uniform with those of Part I, but unfortunately
the margins are so much broader that the bound volume is nearly an inch
longer and broader than its predecessor. Moreover, the paper is glazed
to such a degree that it is annoying to read the book by artificial light on
account of the reflection, and, no doubt because of this glazing, the type
in the fine-print examples failed to make a clear impression in very many
instances, thus producing the effect of much worn type. It is to be hoped
that the faults named will be removed before any more copies are printed.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS

Varia Socratica. First Series. By A. E. TAYLOR, St. Andrews
University Publications, No. IX. Oxford: Parker, 1911.

Professor Taylor, author of an excellent little book on Plato in the
series of "Philosophies Ancient and Modern," makes these studies as a
part of his preparation for a larger work on the philosophy of Plato on
which he is engaged. The central aim that unifies the volume is the attempt
to prove that much more of Platonism than is commonly supposed is Socratic,
or may be traced back even to the Pythagoreans and other pre-Socratics.

One may concede the a-priori historical probability of this thesis and
yet distrust it as a working hypothesis either for the philological study or
the philosophical interpretation of Plato. In the one case, it will mislead
because the evidence needed to verify it is lacking. In the other, it is a
dangerous guide because the assumptions of modern scholarship make us
more likely to miss the incalculable superiority of Plato to his contemporaries
and predecessors than we are to overlook parallels and anticipatory sug-
gestions in pre-Platonic literature. In the lack of space to apply these
principles to the detail of Professor Taylor's book, I can only give a sum-
mary of its content and indicate a few reserves.

The first essay on "The Impiety of Socrates" argues that the impiety
meant in the indictment was Pythagoreanism—the Socrates of the *Gorgias*
and *Phaedo* "frequented a foreign conventicle." The conclusion is reached
by elimination. The accusation of impiety was not brought merely as a
foundation for the charge of corrupting the young. Professor Taylor
thinks that the testimony of Isocrates' *Antidosis* shows that "it would have